

Application No. 10/797,192  
Attorney Docket No. 2519/0294PUS1  
Response to Final Office Action dated 25 Jul 2008  
Page 2 of 3

### REMARKS

Claims 7-10 are pending in the current application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by Umeda (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,107). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 recites a wireless human input device comprising "a first wireless human transmitting unit having a first time set with a first time parameter for generating a first leading signal having a first waveform signal; a second wireless human transmitting unit having a second timer set with a second time parameter for generating a second leading signal having a second waveform signal, wherein the first time parameter and the second time parameter are different such that the wave length of the first waveform signal and the wave length of the second waveform signal are different; and a wireless human receiving unit for receiving the first leading signal and the second leading signal."

Applicants respectfully submit that Umeda fails to teach a first transmitting unit and a second transmitting unit. Umeda merely states a "plurality of transmitters," but never shows a plurality of transmitters. In addition, Umeda refers to element 1 as the plurality of transmitters (See Umeda, col. 8, ll. 45-67). It is clear from Figure 1 that element 1 contains only one transmitter, LED driver 8. The mere fact that element 1 comprises a keyboard input section 4 and trackball 5 does not mean that there exists a plurality of transmitters. The LED driver 8 is the only transmitter that is described or suggested in Umeda. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Umeda could not possibly anticipate claim 7 and that claim 7 is allowable. Because claims 8-

Application No. 10/797,192  
Attorney Docket No. 2519/0294PUS1  
Response to Final Office Action dated 25 Jul 2008  
Page 3 of 3

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 27 2008

10 depend on and therefore contain the limitations of claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable. Withdrawal of the 35 USC 102(b) rejection is requested.

Conclusion


Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Joe McKinney Muncy, Applicants' Attorney, at 703.621.7140 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3828 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; in particular, extension of time fees.

Date: October 27, 2008 (Monday)

Respectfully submitted,



Joe McKinney Muncy  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32334

Muncy, Geissler, Olds & Lowe, PLLC  
PO Box 1364  
Fairfax, VA 22038-1364  
Tel. 703.621.7140  
[mailroom@mg-ip.com](mailto:mailroom@mg-ip.com)